

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/645,376		EUCHNER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jared J. Fureman		2876	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Jared J. Fureman (PTO). (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Ronald Reichman (26,796). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 18 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 8, 15 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sansone (US 6,574,000 B1) and Leon (US 6,701,304 B2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Reichman explained that the declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.131 (filed on 3/12/2007) was used to show that the present application and the Sansone reference were commonly owned at the time of the invention of the present application, not to establish conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Sansone reference. Thus, the Sansone reference would not be usable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In an effort to further prosecution of the application, Mr. Reichman proposed amendments to claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 (see attached copy of the proposed amendment). The examiner stated that he believed that the Leon reference taught claim 15, since Leon teaches multiple readers/detectors (see figure 5). Mr. Reichman indicated that claim 15 (and dependents) would likely be cancelled. It was agreed that claims 1, 8 and 22 (and dependents) appeared to define the invention over the prior art of record, subject to an updated search after receiving a formal amendment. It was agreed that a formal amendment would be filed for further consideration .